REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated March 4, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated June 20, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. A petition for a one-month extension of time, and a request for continued examination (RCE) accompany this Amendment. Claims 1-8 were previously pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claim 9 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are all the claims presently pending in the present application. No new matter has been introduced by the addition of new claim 9. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Given that the Applicants have included an RCE along with this Amendment, an Examiner Interview is now formally requested to help expedite prosecution of the present application. In particular, the Applicants would like the Examiner to point out in detail the information or data relied on in the Takahashi reference that corresponds to the claimed common state and individual state information of the present invention (i.e., as recited in claim 1). The undersigned attorney will also contact the Examiner shortly after filing the Amendment to facilitate the scheduling of the Examiner Interview. The Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Interview be granted and be conducted prior to the issuance of a subsequent action on the merits.

In the Office Action dated March 4, 2008, claims 1-4 and 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,193, hereafter "Takahashi"). The Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons noted below.

The Applicants maintain that Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest at least the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8 as well as the features recited in new claim 9.

With regard to claims 1 and 8, the claims recite the following features not believed to be disclosed or suggested by Takahashi:

"...operation control means, provided in correspondence with each format engine, for pre-defining a correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine, and controlling operations of the format engines such that each format engine is in an arbitrary

7

individual state;

wherein:

when changing a format engine to a pre-defined common state, the format engine managing means sends a message including common state information indicating the pre-defined common state to the operation control means provided in correspondence with the format engine; and

when the message is received from the format engine managing means, the operation control means controls the format engine such that the format engine is in an individual state corresponding to a common state indicated by the common state information included in the message."

The features noted above in independent claims 1 and 8 are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., pgs. 24-36 and Figs. 4, 5a and 5b).

The present application (as recited in claims 1 and 8), uses two kinds of information (i.e., common state information and individual state information) for managing and controlling format engines. As noted above, the common state information is common to all format engines, wherein the individual state information has a format and content that is different for each format engine. At least the following features of claims 1 and 8 are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art:

1) providing a pre-defined correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine, and controlling operations of the format engines such that each format engine is in an arbitrary individual state; and

2) controlling a format engine in an individual state corresponding to a common state included in a message received from a format engine managing means for controlling the format engine.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Takahashi for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8 (e.g., abstract, col. 1, line 50 – col. 2, line 19; col. 9, line 36 – col. 10, line 22; col. 19, line 43 – col. 20, line 23).

However, the abstract and col. 1, line 50 – col. 2, line 19 of Takahashi disclose a controller implemented to read control information stored in peripheral devices via a common communication line, and store the control information in a memory area in a predetermined format.

Additionally, Takahashi at col. 9, line 36 – col. 10, line 22 and col. 19, line 43-col. 20, line 23 discloses controlling the on and off state of a multimedia device using a multimedia controller; and a multimedia device that includes a software object which is a resident multimedia controller for performing management of the entire multimedia device.

Based on the above discussion, the Applicants asset that it is not clear what information or data disclosed in Takahashi corresponds to the claimed common state and individual state information, let alone what in Takahashi corresponds to the claimed predefining of a correspondence between common states and individual states which define the outputting of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine; and controlling the operation format in such that each engine is in an arbitrary individual state.

Based on the above discussion, Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest at least the following features recited in claims 1 and 8:

1)   proving a predefined correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine and a representation different from each format engine, and controlling operations of the format engine such that each format engine is in an arbitrary individual state; and

2)   controlling a format engine in an individual state corresponding to a common state including a message received from a format engine managing means for controlling the format engine.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Takahashi. Additionally, dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 7 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Takahashi based at least on their dependency from independent claim 1.

In the Office Action dated March 4, 2008, claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi. Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. As

noted above, Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1. Accordingly, no modification of or combination with Takahashi would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claim 5 by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1.

With regard to claim 9, the claim recites the following: "[a]n information processor according to claim 4, further comprising, as the format engine, Java middleware for executing a Java program and a browser for displaying HTML contents." No modification of or combination with Takahashi would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the features noted above in claim 9. Additionally, claim 9 depends (indirectly) from claim 1. Accordingly, no modification of or combination with Takahashi would result in, or otherwise render obvious claim 9 also by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated March 4, 2008, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuki HORII et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/
By:2008.07.07 16:39:25 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 7, 2008